



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

share of the *Beowulf* was first and foremost that of working up the original lays into a single poem; but besides this, certain parts of the poem exhibit Anglo-Saxon alteration of the original material. At first hand this is true of the description of the fight with the dragon, where archæological monuments of Scandinavian and Anglo-Saxon character are mentioned in turn, while as regards language a decided difference has been observed between this and those other parts of the poem which have not the stamp of the Anglo-Saxon mind." (p. 85.)

As may be seen from the last part of this quotation, Stjerna's philological views of the *Beowulf* must be taken with caution. He does not always look carefully enough at the text and the context, some of his interpretations are not quite up-to-date, and he is liable to overshoot the mark in drawing far-reaching conclusions from certain literal renderings unduly insisted upon. But even in those cases where we are bound to disagree with the author, the value of his wonderfully rich material in illustrating the 'life of the times' remains unimpaired.

Dr. Hall, the well-known author of one of the most helpful translations of *Beowulf*, has rendered us a genuine service in bringing out this book, especially as he did not content himself with rendering the Swedish essays into English, but assumed the function of a conscientious and skilful editor besides. In addition to a general Introduction setting forth the scope and importance of the treatises, he has introduced numerous critical footnotes of distinct value, in which he puts the reader on his guard against doubtful or erroneous statements of the text. He has also contributed an excellent 'Index of Things mentioned in the Poem of Beowulf', taken, with some alterations and additions, from his translation of the poem.

FR. KLAEBER.

The University of Minnesota.

DE MET HET PARTICIPIUM PRAETERITI OMSCHREVEN WERKWOORDSVORMEN IN'T NEDERLANDS

door Dr. J. H. Kern. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam. Afdeeling Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks. Deel XII No. 2. Amsterdam, Johannes Muller, 1912. Pp. V and 319.

This work treats of the historic development of the compound tense and voice forms that are made by the use of the past participle in connection with some auxiliary verb. It

not only traces the history of form and meaning but also the history of the various theories that have been offered to explain these forms and their meaning. This treatise has a marked peculiarity. It does not put the author's own contributions in the foreground so that undue attention is attracted to them to the detriment of the general outline. The author modestly inserts the results of his own investigations at the proper place in the general development so that the orderly historical narrative is never interrupted and the view is never obscured.

This work is much more than it professes to be. The author modestly represents his treatise as a history of the Dutch forms. In fact it is a history of the Germanic development of active and passive tense forms. Not only the Scandinavian, German, English, Dutch, and Frisian forms have been treated, but the Dutch and Low German dialects have received careful attention, and the Romance languages, Russian, Sanskrit, Latin, and Greek have been skilfully introduced into the discussion. Professor Kern's official activity in Groningen in teaching English, Russian and Sanskrit has enlarged his vision and brought the breadth of view into this study that is usually so sadly lacking in treatises of this kind. This patient and valuable study of the different Dutch and Low German dialects has strengthened the present writer's faith in the value of dialect study in general and brought home to him in a rather painful way the fact that his own *Grammar of the German Language* would be a better book if he had paid a little more attention to the closely related Dutch dialects, which in a number of places throw bright light upon the German development. On the other hand, the writer feels that Professor Kern might possibly have profited a little if he had read the *Grammar of the German Language*, which in a place or two throws a little light upon the general question under consideration. Professor Kern has, like European scholars in general, not thought it worth while to read American publications, but he is thoroughly posted on everything that has appeared in Europe. It is interesting to note how even after his manuscript was closed he has worked into his treatise as best he could the fruits of the latest research. At the close among his "corrections" he comments favorably upon the recent valuable contribution of Professor Kurrelmeyer in "*Zeitschrift für Deutsche Wortforschung*" 12, 157 ff., and thus thru the instrumentality of a German periodical an American scholar comes to his own.

This treatise, one of the most valuable monographs the writer has ever read, ought to be in the possession of every Germanic

scholar. Its 319 closely printed large pages are too crowded with facts to be reproduced briefly here. A few of the principal results are given here in the hope that they may stimulate to the reading of the original work or at least be of some assistance to the student of Germanic syntax.

In Germanic there were only two distinct tense forms, the present and the past. The former was used for both the present and the future. The first attempts to form compound tenses were made by associating the auxiliaries *werden* and *sein* with the past participles of transitives and mutative intransitives, i. e. intransitives that indicate a change of place or condition. Originally in all such compound tenses the past participle was merely a predicate adjective without the slightest temporal force: "*das Dorf ist am Walde gelegen*", "*das Dorf war am Walde gelegen*". The time was that indicated by the verb. Thus in the oldest period the tense was either present or past, for there were only two tenses. This is the situation after both *wairþan* and *wesan* in Gothic, the oldest Germanic language. This oldest condition is still occasionally preserved in modern German, as seen by these two examples.

The participle a little later acquired temporal force, as this new meaning was often naturally suggested by the situation: "*er ist gefallen*"; "*er war gestorben, ehe ich ankam*". The time is here no longer that indicated by the verb. We have here two new tenses—perfect and pluperfect. This was a very natural development, for it took place in a number of languages: "*lapsus sum*" "*ich bin ausgelitten*" "*ik ben uitgegleden*", etc. In the course of the Old High German period these compound forms acquired the following meanings. The past participle in connection with *sein* formed the perfect and pluperfect tenses, passive in force where the verb was transitive and active where it was intransitive: "*er ist gesehen*" (old perfect passive, which is still in use in North Germany and Holland), "*er war gesehen*" (old pluperfect passive); "*er ist gekommen*" (perfect active), "*er war gekommen*" (pluperfect active). The past participle in connection with *werden* formed the present and past tenses, passive in force where the verb was transitive and active where the verb was intransitive: "*er wird geschlagen*" (present passive), "*er ward geschlagen*" (past passive): "*weorðeð cumen*" (old active present) (Gen. 2196) "*will come*", literally *becomes come*. At first the passive present with *werden* could only be formed where the participle had perfective force, i. e. represented the action as completed: "*Das Haus wird jedes Jahr angestrichen*" "*The house is*

painted every year". In the course of the O. H. G. period this form, which at first was only used to denote an act as a whole, as completed, and is called the actional passive, acquired in addition imperfect, progressive force: "Das Haus *wird* jetzt *angestrichen*" "The house is now being painted."

Of these forms the one made with *werden* and the participle of an intransitive verb, as in the example from Gen. 2196 given above, disappeared in the different languages. In O. H. G. and in O. E. alongside of the present and past passive forms with *werdan* there were also forms with *wesan* and *beon* in English and forms with *wesan* in German. Thus the participle with *wesan* was used to denote the present and past tenses and also the perfect and pluperfect. In the following centuries the German and English peoples tried to extricate themselves from this tangle and find a clearer expression for their thought. In German the forms with *wesan* gradually disappeared in the present and past wherever the reference was to an act, but remained where the idea of state was present: "Das Haus *wird* jedes Jahr *angestrichen*" (actional) and "Das Haus *wird* jetzt *angestrichen*" (progressive), but "Das Haus *ist* *angestrichen*" (perfective form denoting a state). In accordance with the older usage, however, *sein* is still regularly used with actional force in the imperative and often also in the infinitive: "Küsse Lieschen und die Kinder und *sei* geküsst von Deinem Theodor" (*Fontane an seine Frau*, March 10, 1857). "Er wollte nicht daran *erinnert sein*" (Wildenbruch's *Die Alten und die Jungen*). The writer has given many examples in his "Grammar", (pp. 300-1). In general, however, the differentiation at this point in German became quite clear.

There remained, however, one difficulty—the perfective present and past had the same form as the actional perfect and pluperfect. In the thirteenth century the ambiguous *ist* and *war* of the old actional perfect and pluperfect were replaced by the perfect and pluperfect forms of *werden*, which was already in use as the auxiliary of the present and past tense, so that the same auxiliary might be used thruout the passive system: "Das Haus *ist* *angestrichen worden*" (actional perfect passive), etc. A corresponding perfective perfect and pluperfect were formed by the use of the perfect and pluperfect tenses of *sein*: "Das Haus *ist* *angestrichen gewesen*." The old obscure actional forms still linger on in the colloquial language of North Germany and Holland. Es wird bestritten, dass ein japanischer Kreuzer *gesehen ist* (*Hamburger Nachrichten*, Jan. 14, 1905). Professor Kern on p. 38 warmly defends the older perfect and pluperfect forms here

and brands the new Dutch forms with *worden* as a learned product introduced from Germany. The writer thinks Professor Kern is misled here by his enthusiastic love of natural expression as found in the language of the common people. Above *natural* expression is *more perfect* expression. Man has ever restlessly struggled to find a more accurate expression for his thought and feeling. Popular speech has always been a rich source of strength and vigor to all languages, but it is not the only source. The scholar has the same right that the humblest man or woman has, the right to fit his expression to his thought and feeling. Just like the common man he uses the means that are at his disposal. If the closely related German language suggests to the cultured Dutchman a clearer expression for his thought who can prove that in using it he is not contributing to the wealth of his mother tongue?

Unfortunately Englishmen did not work out of their difficulties at this point as successfully as the South Germans. In the first place they lost *weorþan* entirely and thus lost the possibility of the differentiation found in German. We now use *to be* with the participle to express both the actional and the perfective present and past passive. English has, however, recently acquired a progressive present and past passive, for which German and Dutch have no distinctive form: "*The house is being painted*". By the change of the old perfect and pluperfect *is* and *was* in the Middle English to *has been* and *had been*, the usual perfect and pluperfect forms of these words when used as independent verbs, we acquired clear perfect and pluperfect forms but unfortunately without any power to distinguish the actional and perfective idea: "*The house has (or had) been painted*", with either actional or perfective force according to the connection.

A little later than the earliest of the developments sketched above came the use of a transitive verb with *haben* or *eigan* (later entirely replaced by *haben*). In the first stage the participle was a predicative adjective, as in the case of the participle used with *werdan* and *wesan*, differing only in that it was an objective predicate, i. e. agreed with the object instead of the subject: "*sie eigun mir ginomanan liabon druhtin minan*" (Otfrid, 1.4.53) "*they have taken my dear Savior from me*", literally "*possess him taken from me*". The neuter adjective could always assume the uninflected form in the accusative: "*ih haben iz funtan*" (id). The meaning often naturally, as in the second example, suggested the association of the object with the participle rather than with the verb, and thus gradually the idea of a perfect and pluperfect tense

became established with uninflected participle. This usage gradually spread to transitives without an object and to verbs that governed a genitive or dative, as there was in all these cases a close similarity of construction to that found in transitives.

The last step in the development was the extension of the use of *haben* to non-mutative intransitives, i. e. such as do not indicate a change of place or condition: “*er hat gearbeitet*”, “*er hat lange geirrt*”. Thus two groups of intransitives stood over against each other, the non-mutatives with *haben*, the mutatives with *sein*: “*Der Schiffer hat* (to denote an act) or *ist* (to denote a change of place) *abgestossen*”. The non-mutatives assumed *haben* as they approached in meaning the transitives without an object, which had still earlier under the influence of transitives become associated with *haben*. Professor Hermann Paul’s investigations led him to the conclusion that *haben* has imperfective or durative force, while *sein* has perfective meaning: “*er hat lange gelitten*”, but “*er ist in der Stadt angekommen*,” “*er ist nach Hause gefahren*”, “*er ist erkrankt*”, “*er ist gestorben*”. Perfectives call attention, not to an act as a whole, but only to a point in the activity, the end, which may be either the final goal, as in “*Er ist in der Stadt angekommen*”—the effective perfective—or the beginning of something new, as in “*Er ist eingeschlafen, abgereist*” “He has fallen asleep, has departed”, literally “He has gotten into sleeping, departing”—the ingressive perfective. Professor Kern has called attention to a serious error in Professor Paul’s rule. We often use *haben* with intransitive perfectives, as in “*Er hat laut aufgelacht*” “He broke out into a loud laugh”. His rule must be amended to: *Sein* is used with *mutative* intransitive perfectives.

Wherever there is a doubleness of conception South Germans are manifesting a growing fondness for *sein* to call attention to the mutative idea. Thus *haben* in “*durch welche schulde die helde her gevarn han*” (*Nibelungenlied*, Aventure VI) “for what purpose the heroes have come here” has been replaced by *sein*. The M. H. G. poet calls attention to the linear perfective idea, i. e. the idea of a continuous movement until the goal is reached, while the modern South German feels the mutative idea as the more important. South German has had a marked influence upon the literary language at this point. Thus we now find quite commonly in the best authors such sentences as “*Wir sind den ganzen Tag marschiert*”, altho the durative idea is prominent. The mutative idea has become associated with such verbs and *sein* is used even where

there is no goal expressed. Hollanders here regularly give expression to the durative idea where it is prominent: "De soldaten *hebben* drie uur gemarzjeerd", but "Het leger is in een dag van A. naar B. gemarsjeerd". Also North Germans occasionally employ *haben* for the durative idea in accordance with the tendency in North German dialects: "So hat er lange Jahre neben seinem Hundefuhrwerk durch die Dörfer getrabt" (Frennsen's *Jörn Uhl*, chap. XI). North Germans generally resist South German usage in case of *beharren*, *beruhen*, *bestehen*, *hangen*, *hocken*, *liegen*, *schweben*, *sitzen*, *stecken*, *stehen*, etc.: "Viele Monate hatte er im Spital gelegen", where a South German regularly uses *war* as he does not think so much of the continuation in the lying position as of the ingressive linear idea of getting into a long-continuing prostration. The literary language of the North, however, follows this usage here in the case of *bleiben* and *sein*.

The latter verb did not originally belong here, and hence was once conjugated with *haben* in the North, but it has long been intimately associated with the mutative *werden* and in the South was influenced by it. Also in Dutch the auxiliary *hebben*, once almost exclusively in use here, has gradually yielded to *zijn* as auxiliary with *zijn*. Professor Kern does not positively state whether he regards this outcome as autochthonic development or the result of German influence. The writer thinks the latter probable, as this new usage, as far as he can see, developed, not in colloquial speech, but in the literary language, which has been subject to the influence of literary German. Of course the analogy of *worden* (= *werden*) facilitated the development. In both German and Dutch the verb *sein* "to be" has gradually been approaching the meaning of *werden*, differing however in that its meaning is ingressive linear, i. e. "to get into a long-continuing state", while *werden* indicates mere entrance into a state. When we translate: "Er ist lange im Gefängnis gewesen" by "He was in prison for a long time" we look at the thought from the English point of view. The German actually says: "He got into prison for a long period."

In contrast to their usual fondness for *haben* Hollanders and North Germans at one point use *sein* where South Germans employ *haben*, namely in case of *anfangen* and in Dutch also in case of *afnemen*, *toenemen*, *beginnen*: "Zijn krachten zijn weer toegenomen" = "seine Kräfte haben wieder zugenommen". Professor Kern does not call attention to this development in literary German. The writer gives two examples of this usage with *anfangen* in his "Grammar", p. 296. He has since found another: "Wie ich schon sagte,

ist man erst in den letzten Jahren *angefangen*, von dem Kloster das zu retten und zu erhalten, was noch zu erretten und zu erhalten ist" (O. E. Kiesel in *Hamburger Nachrichten*, Feb. 13, 1905). This common Dutch and Low German construction is beginning to affect literary North German. This use of *sein* in a section of the country partial to *haben* is explained by the simple fact that these forms were originally passive: "Du hast natürlich nicht daran gedacht, dass gestern die Pfingstferein *angefangen sind*" (Frennsen's "*Die drei Getreuen*," chap. II). Here *angefangen sind* is probably the perfect tense of a mutative intransitive, but it is also the common North German perfect passive and may possibly perform this function here as the subject of the verb is a thing, but such forms can only be interpreted as mutative intransitive perfects where the subject of the verb is a person, as in the sentence quoted above from the North German writer O. E. Kiesel. Thus both North and South Germany are contributing to the spread of *sein* and the mutative idea.

The English mind, on the other hand, began in the Middle English period to manifest a disregard for the mutative idea. Professor Kern gives no reason for this development. The present writer explains it by a desire for a clearer expression of the idea of tense. The colorless *has* was a more appropriate form for this purpose than *is*, which is too closely associated with present time to denote past time clearly: "he *has* often come too late", "he *has fallen* more than once", "he *has* often gone to town on stormy days". Thus English has developed more sharply than German and Dutch the idea of tense. Every verb in the language assumes the same form to denote the same tense.

GEORGE O. CURME.

Northwestern University.